Remarks

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejection and further examination are requested.

Initially, the Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for conducting the personal interview on February 22, 2007.

Claims 1, 2, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Lucas (US 4,652,903).

Claim 1 has been amended so as to further distinguish the present invention, as recited therein, from the reference relied upon in the rejection. Support for the amendment to claim 1 can be found at least at page 12, lines 3-23 of the original specification.

It is also noted that claim 2 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the subject matter contained therein.

The above-mentioned rejection is submitted to be inapplicable to the amended claims for the following reasons.

Claim 1 is patentable over Lucas, since claim 1 recites a signal transmitter including, in part, a signal multiplexing part operable to multiplex a time-base-compressed audio signal and a video signal by employing a control signal, and output a video/audio multiplexed signal and the control signal to a signal receiver, wherein the control signal, employed by the signal multiplexing part to multiplex the time-based-compressed audio signal and the video signal, indicates an area of a synchronizing period of the video signal where the time-based-compressed audio data is located in the generated video/audio multiplexed signal. Lucas fails to disclose or suggest a signal multiplexing part employing a control signal as recited in claim 1.

Lucas discloses an encoder including a multiplexer 118. The multiplexer 118 receives a luminance signal from a luminance store 110a, a chrominance signal from a chrominance store 110b, a compressed audio signal from a sampling circuit 116 and a combination of synchronization, timing and teletext information, all occurring at the Multiplexed Analog Components (MAC) sampling frequency (1365 f_H). The multiplexer 118 then combines the four signals by selecting them at appropriate times for inclusion in a MAC video line using a clock signal operating at the MAC sampling frequency, which is also supplied to the multiplexer 118. Lucas also discloses that the compressed audio signal can be transmitted during the horizontal blanking interval (HBI) of the video data and the combination of synchronization, timing and

teletext information are transmitted during the vertical blanking interval (VBI) of the video data. (See column 2, lines 9-15; column 4, lines 64-67; column 5, line 56 – column 6, line 38 and Figure 4).

In the rejection, the multiplexer 118 is relied upon as corresponding to the claimed signal multiplexing part. As discussed above, the multiplexer 118 combines the four signals, including the compressed audio signal, by "selecting them at the appropriate time" and operates at the MAC sampling frequency. Further, the compressed audio signal is generally disclosed as being transmitted during the HBI of the video data. However, Lucas fails to disclose or suggest that the multiplexer 118 uses a control signal to multiplex the four signals, whereby the control signal indicates an area of the HBI where the compressed audio signal is located in the multiplexed signal output to a signal receiver and is itself output to the signal receiver.

Lucas does disclose that the multiplexer 118 performs the multiplexing of the four signals according to the clock signal with the MAC sampling frequency. However, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the clock signal indicates an area of the HBI where the compressed audio signal is located in the multiplexed signal. Further, it is clear that the clock signal is not output to a signal receiver. As a result, the clock signal does not correspond to the claimed control signal.

Further, the multiplexer 118 does receive the combination of synchronization, timing and teletext information which are transmitted during the VBI. However, it is clear that there is no disclosure or suggestion in Lucas that the synchronization, timing and teletext information indicate an area of the HBI where the compressed audio signal is located in the multiplexed signal. As a result, none of the synchronization, timing and teletext information corresponds to the claimed control signal.

In light of the above discussion, it is apparent that the multiplexer 118 of Lucas does not utilize a control signal as is the case with the claimed signal multiplexing part. As a result, claim 1 is patentable over Lucas.

Because of the above-mentioned distinctions, it is believed clear that claims 1, 11 and 12 are allowable over the reference relied upon in the rejection. Furthermore, it is submitted that the distinctions are such that a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention would not have been motivated to make any combination of the references of record in such a manner as to result in, or otherwise render obvious, the present invention as recited in claims 1, 11 and

12. Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 11 and 12 are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that there are issues remaining which must be resolved before allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Hidekazu SUZUKI et al.

By: David M. Ovedovitz

David M. Ovedovitz
Registration No. 45,336
Attorney for Applicants

DMO/jmj
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
April 4, 2007